and to be again corrupted, but also that this had been, and would be done over aud over again, in infinite vicissitudes.

Furthermore, as the world's eternity was generally opposed by all the ancient Atheists, so it was maintained also by some Theists, and that not only Aristotle/ but also before him, by Ocellus Lueaaus[b] at least, though Aristotle thought not fit to take any notice of him ; as likewise the latter Platonists universally went that way, yet so, as that they always supposed the world to have as much depended upon the Deity, as if it had been once created out of nothing by it.

To conclude, therefore: neither they, who asserted the world's generation and temporary beginning, were all Theists, nor they, who maintained its eternity, all Atheists; but before Aristotle's time, the Atheists universally, and most of the Theists, did both ^.like conclude the world to have been made; the difference between them lying in this, that the one affirmed the world to have been made by God, the other by the fortuitous motion of matter.

Wherefore, if we would put another difference betwixt the Theists and Atheists here, as to this particular, we must distinguish betwixt the system of the world and the substance of the matter. For the ancient Atheists, though they generally denied the eternity of the world, yet they supposed the substance of the matter, not only to have been eternal, but also self-existent and independent upon any other Being; they making it the first principle and original of all things, and con-

[a] Pbysic, Anscultat. lib. viii.

$, inter Scriptor. MythoL a Tho. (.ale cditos, p.60k